

## REMARKS

The examiner noted the use of trademarks should be properly cited to Patent Office rules. The use of the word VELCRO has been used with the proper generic terminology.

The applicant has also looked up "Nylon" and "Neoprene" and found they are not trademarks for use as a synthetic fiber and for artificial rubber respectively so the specification has been amended for these words.

The examiner objected to claim 1 lines 10-12 and lines 13-15 as containing duplicate limitations.

The straps in question in line 10-12 are for above the knee and those in lines 13-15 are for below the knee so there is not duplicate limitation.

The examiner stated Howard anticipated claims 1-8.

Howard has a shin portion 18 which the applicant does not have. The chaps in the application end just below the knee and do not have separate shin protective pads and shin pockets for the pads. Further, Howard has three leg straps and the chaps in the application have two leg straps. As the examiner pointed out the specification stated the invention has removably attached pockets. The claims were amended to claim removably attached pockets which Howard does not have.

With the above differences between Howard and the claimed invention, particularly as the claims were amended, the invention is not anticipated.

The examiner stated claims 1-8 were obvious over Howard in view of Zevchak.

Since the claims are not like Howard as shown above the combination of Howard and Zevchak is not obvious. The combination of Howard and Zevchak would not yield the claimed invention since there are not shin protective pockets, no shin protective pads and no shin straps to secure the shin portion of the garment to the leg of the user. Further, Zevchak is for a garment with interchangeable pockets. All the pockets of Zevchak are of

the same design but can be placed in different locations. The applicant does not have interchangeable pockets all of the same design but specialized pockets for different uses in specific places.

Nothing in the combination of Howard in view of Zevchak suggests the use of different kinds of pockets in a garment to change the use of the garment. For example the applicant claims one type of pocket for use in gardening which can be replaced by a different type of pocket in the same location for use in roofing. Claim 1 was amended to claim the use of specialized removably attached pockets, thus one garment can take the place of several garments by changing, adding or removing the specialized pockets. Therefore the combination of Howard in view of Zevchak does not render the claims obvious.